

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **I. Concerning the Amendments**

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to specify the monomers having latent crosslinking functionality, and to specify that said monomers are present in an amount of from greater than 5 to 50%. Claims 3, 4, 15 and 16 are cancelled, as they are redundant in view of the amendments to Claims 1 and 9. Claims 11 and 12 are amended to correct typographical errors.

### **II. Concerning the Rejections**


Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Huth et al. (hereinafter Huth). Applicants believe the amendments to Claims 1 and 9 obviate the basis for this rejection, as Huth does not disclose or suggest the compositions of the amended claims.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Simpson et al. (hereinafter Simpson). Applicants believe Simpson neither teaches nor suggests the subject matter of Claim 1 in view of the inclusion of the subject matter of Claim 3 into Claim 1.

Claims 9-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by WO 99/18157 (hereinafter Vandezande). Applicants believe that the subject matter of amended Claims 9-14 is not taught or suggested by Vandezande.

Reconsideration of the claims and passing of the application to allowance are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul D. Hayhurst  
Registration No. 30,180  
Phone: 989-636-9373

P. O. Box 1967  
Midland, MI 48641-1967

ajd